



The Task Force on Court Facilities
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3660

South Planning Committees Meeting Report
Wednesday, April 19, 2000 9:30 AM

Fourth Appellate District, Division 1
750 B Street, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92101-8196

ATTENDEES: SOUTH COMMITTEE MEMBERS: PRESENT: Mr. John Clarke Hon. Daniel Kremer Hon. Charles Smith Hon. Wayne Peterson Ms. Yvonne Campos ABSENT: Mr. Hector De La Torre Mr. Wylie Aitken GUESTS: Mr. John Van Whervin, Los Angeles County Superior Court Mr. Joseph Fallin, Los Angeles County Superior Court Mr. Rick Dostal, Orange County Executive Office Mr. Ron Guley, Orange County Superior Court Mr. Peter Conlon, Orange County Superior Court	CONSULTANTS TO THE TASK FORCE: Mr. Jay Smith, DMJM Mr. Andy Cupples, DMJM Mr. Simon Park, DMJM TASK FORCE STAFF: Mr. Bruce Newman, Facilities Planner, AOC
--	---

I. OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Clarke welcomed the committee members and opened the meeting shortly after 9:30 AM.

II. OLD BUSINESS

Minutes of the Committee Meeting # 2 were approved with suggestions to correct San Bernardino county population growth projected date from year 2000 to 2020.

III. MEETING SHCEDULE

The next Planning Committee Meetings for both South and North Committees will be held on May 17, 2000. Both Planning Committee Meetings will be held in same location. DMJM Los Angeles Headquarters is tentatively named as the location for the next Planning Committee Meeting. Bruce Newman will confirm the location with the North Planning Committee.

IV. COUNTY PRESENTATIONS

Andy Cupples presented findings and planning options for the counties of Madera, Mariposa, Merced and Ventura. Simon Park and Andy Cupples also discussed progress of Los Angeles County survey.

Merced County – Andy Cupples

The county operates a Consolidated Court system in nine facilities with 10 judicial positions. The county's current population is 209,450 and is projected to reach 380,000 by year 2020.

The 9 facilities in Merced County mostly have one courtroom. One of the nine facilities has two courtrooms and another has three courtrooms. Two of the facilities in Merced are modular structures. These court facilities are all clustered around the government center in the City of Merced except the one in Los Banos 35 miles away. The Merced County made several proposals and efforts for a new building to centralize (or partially centralize) the courts but was unsuccessful in funding the proposed projects.

Most significant problem with the county's court facilities related to building security and separation of access between in-custody, public, and judicial officers. Other issues include inadequate or malfunctioning building systems, poor image as court facilities and general maintenance problems. In terms of physical rating, two of the nine facilities are rated "adequate" and rest are rated "marginal" except the Civil & Small Claims Building which is rated "deficient". Functionally, only the Los Banos and Municipal Criminal Court facilities are rated "adequate" while the rest are rated either "deficient" or "marginal".

Discussion: Andy Cupples mentioned that when we do our program adjustments to options, for juvenile courts attached to juvenile halls, the holding areas programmed by the model will be deleted as holding will be provided within the juvenile halls. Also, our programming model assumes that the Multi-Purpose courtrooms will hold in-custody trials and therefore the model will generate holding spaces to support the Multi-Purpose courtrooms.

80% of county courtrooms are used as multi-purpose courtrooms with all jury trials being held in the facilities in Merced. Six of the ten courtrooms in the county are jury capable and four are non-jury capable. On the other hand, only three of the ten are in-custody capable and has holding attached to the courtroom. This makes nearly half of the courtrooms not adequate to serve as multi-purpose courtrooms. Of the ten existing courtrooms, only two of the courtrooms are considered functionally adequate, four are rated marginal and the remaining four are rated deficient for current use. Current inventory of courts' space is approximately 29,000 sq. ft. The database-programming model is likely to generate over 100,000-sq. ft. required for the ten existing courtrooms.

Discussion: In regards to the building-level rating for seismic structural resistance, Andy Cupples mentioned that the model will generate seismic upgrade cost based on the construction type and year of construction unless a known seismic retrofit is done on the building or an investigative report provides any upgrade costs.

Seven of the ten courtrooms in the Merced County are considered deficient with only two of the ten rated adequate. When optimum use evaluation, three of the seven deficient courtrooms can be “adequate” courtrooms if used as civil courtrooms as opposed to their current use.

As for the court support spaces, 50% of the 19,000 sq. ft. total area is considered adequate. Per programming model, the space required for current use for the county will be 114,547 sq. ft. Currently, the county operates its courts out of 29,014 sq. ft. total area. Based on optimum use evaluation, the space required slightly increased to 115,521 sq. ft., but the shortfall reduces to 92,945 sq. ft. The projected capital improvement for the county per model is \$37,660,168.

Planning Issues

Discussion: The county options being sent out to counties will be based on year 2020 need. If the counties make inputs related to prioritized capital development, such input may be reflected in the final County Options.

Merced is a moderate size county. The population is concentrated around the city of Merced and expected to double in 20 years. Currently the county is considering building a two-courtroom building to replace an existing building.

Summary of Options

Option 1: Reuse

Maintain 6 existing facilities; abandon 4 existing facilities; construct 3 new facilities in Merced; the total estimated cost of the new buildings is \$14,592,075; the adjusted budget for upgrade of the existing buildings and the construction of new buildings is \$24,100,369.

Pros (+) and Cons (-)

- +Lowest Capital Cost
- +Multiple projects-potential ease of phasing
- Multiple facilities-Increased staffing, O& M costs
- Least Compliance with Recommended Guidelines
- Poor Public Service/Convenience

Option 2: Partial Consolidation

Maintain 4 existing facilities; abandon 6 facilities; build 1 new building in the City of Merced; the total estimated cost of the new buildings is \$18,906,029; the adjusted budget for upgrade of the existing buildings and the construction of new buildings is \$26,979,080.

Pros (+) and Cons (-)

- +Balance of capital and long-term Operational Implications
- +Increased User Friendliness
- +Increased Compliance with Guidelines
- Higher Capital Costs
- Abandon High Percentage of Existing Space

Option 3: Full consolidation

Build one new building to centrally locate all courts; abandon 9 existing buildings except the Los Banos facility for local services; the total estimated cost of the new buildings is \$31,963,336; the adjusted budget for upgrade of the existing buildings and the construction of new buildings is \$40,043,689.

Pros (+) and Cons (-)

- +Full Compliance with Guidelines
- +Lowest long-term
- +One Stop Access to all Court Functions for Public

- Highest Capital Costs
- Lowest Potential for Phased Funding/Implementations
- May Require New Site

Per our model calculations, the cost to meet current and projected shortfalls based per design guideline requirements is \$47,075,210.

Discussion: The options and the costs associated with each option do not factor in the costs for parking spaces or structures. Site development costs, site acquisition, potential revenue related to land transactions. Andy Cupples and Jay Smith suggested that is not part of the scope and the focus of the study. Justice Kremer suggested that such off-setting costs in property transaction may be taken into account if counties respond during their review.

The Planning Committee has approved the county options as presented and directed to forward the draft County Plan to Merced County for it's review.

Mariposa County-Andy Cupples

Mariposa is a small county (30 mile x 12 mile) operating out of one courthouse with two courtrooms and two judicial positions. The current population is 16,975 and is projected to grow to 27,100 in Year 2020. The current caseload is 3,239 and that is projected to grow to 5,868. This caseload (current and projected) is considered low for two judicial FTE's. No additional judicial positions are projected.

Discussion: The Committee directed to proceed with developing planning options for Mariposa County based on the current two courtrooms.

The Historic Courthouse is 5,920 sq. ft. of Gross Floor Area. The building physical rating is "marginal" and the functional rating is also "marginal". While the courthouse lacks the amenities of modern court facilities, it has good organization layout. There is currently no building security screening and much of the building is a does not meet ADA requirement. The building also has insufficient building systems and is not equipped for technology systems. The two courtrooms currently serve as multi-purpose courtrooms. Only one of the two courtrooms is Jury Capable and non are In-custody capable.

Planning Options:

Option 1:Reuse Existing

Reuse existing and construct annex for support functions.

The total estimated cost of the annex is \$2,697,184; the adjusted budget for upgrade of the existing buildings and the construction of new buildings is \$3,219,955.

Pros (+) and Cons (-)

Not presented

Option 2:Construct a new 2-Courtroom Facility

Abandon Historical Courthouse for a new 2-courtroom facility with support spaces within the City of Mariposa. The total estimated cost of the new building is \$5,201,149.

Pros (+) and Cons (-)

Not presented

Discussion: The Option 2 assumes the two new courtroom facility will be built for Jury-Capable courtrooms and will generate more cost in comparison to the computer generated model which is based projected need of one Jury and one Non-Jury Capable courtrooms. Per our model calculations, the cost to meet current and projected shortfalls based per design guideline

requirements is \$4,790,228. The Committee directed to develop an option for improvements to the existing Historical Building without an additional space or a new building.

Madera County-Andy Cupples

Madera County operates its court system out of 7 courtrooms, mainly centralized in the City of Madera. The courts are in four buildings, one of which is in Sierra. The population is expected to grow to 203,200 by Year 2020 from the current count of 117,300. The Sierra facility is used as a Multi-Purpose courtroom but operates on a part time basis. The caseload is projected to increase from 32,447 to 56,354 by Year 2020 and the Judicial FTE from 10 to 13.

While the physical ratings for all four court facilities are rated “adequate” or “marginal”, the functional ratings are “deficient” except for the Chowchilla Court Building which is rated “marginal”. Major deficiencies are related to the lack of security screening (also general building security), lack of separation of circulation for in-custody, poor organization of component spaces, and other building systems related inadequacies.

Planning Issues:

The geographical shape of the county is elongated (25 mile x 95 mile) and is mostly mountains and valleys.

The county has a Request For Proposal issued for construction of a new 14-courtroom courthouse in Madera which is intended to replace all facilities in the City of Madera. The facility in Sierra is intended to remain as a satellite facility. The development of planning options will be done based on the projected 13 Judicial FTE although the county plans for 14 courtrooms plus one in Sierra.

Planning Options:

Option 1: Build new and maintain satellite

Build a new 13-courtroom facility in Madera, in downtown or near the adult & juvenile detention center. The total estimated cost of the annex is \$22,919,347; the adjusted budget for upgrade of the existing buildings and the construction of new buildings is \$28,949,331.

Pros (+) and Cons (-)

Not presented

The Committee directed to proceed with the presented options.

Ventura County-Andy Cupples

The Ventura County operates its consolidated court system out of 36 total courtrooms mainly in two facilities; 1 of the 36 courtrooms is a rented courtroom in the College of Law used as an overflow courtroom or for special cases. The Hall of Justice in the City of Ventura houses 30 courtrooms and the East County Courthouse has 5 courtrooms.

The county's caseload is expected to increase to 242,524 in Year 2020 from its current load of 183,747. The county currently has a total of 31 Judicial FTE's and is projected to increase to 47 in year 2020.

There is an apparent discrepancy between the number of planned addition of courtroom by the county and the projected needs. The county options for Ventura County will be developed based on existing number of courtrooms and the projected need (36 existing and 47 projected).

The Hall of Justice is located in the County Center Campus next to the County Detention facility. Both the physical and functional rating are "adequate" for its current use. The East County Courthouse is rated "adequate" for its physical rating and "marginal" for functional rating. The inadequate in-custody circulation and security screening are the key problems for the East County Courthouse. The court, located in Simi Valley Civic Center, is also considered to be located too far east from the population center of the East County.

Of the county's total inventory of courtrooms, 28 of 36 courtrooms are jury capable; 35 of 36 courtrooms are fully or partially in-custody capable. The total space used by the courts is 185,930 sq. ft. which translates to approx. 4,000 sq. ft. per courtroom. This is considered low by the programming model but the most of the courtrooms are rated at the worst functionally "marginal" for current use (4 of 36 rated marginal). Most of the support spaces are rated functionally "adequate". This general functional adequacy has been taken into account during the shortfall analysis and is reflected in the Adjusted Shortfall calculations.

The county is projected to need 11 more courtrooms by Year 2020 bring the total to 47 courtrooms. The Ventura County Superior Court intends to focus its future developments at the Hall of Justice site. The courts also has plans to locate 6 to 10 courtrooms at the newly being developed Juvenile (Detention) Campus. The unadjusted estimated total cost to meet the shortfall is \$95,156,236 of which \$20M is for projected need. The estimated cost to meet the Adjusted Shortfall is \$50,654,156.

Planning Options:

Option 1: Expand HOJ

Add 11 new courtrooms for Civil-Jury and support spaces; use the East County Courthouse for non-custody proceedings; continue use of College of Law courtroom. The total estimated cost of the new construction is \$19,503,929; the existing buildings will not receive significant capital improvement. The total project cost for Option 1 is estimated at \$24,379,911.

Discussion: For developing planning options, the consultants are assuming all new courtrooms planned to be jury courtrooms in order to allow for flexibility in actual use of the future courtrooms. This will generate additional space for the model program resulting in additional development cost. While detailed assignment of courtroom types during the development of the planning options, the task is considered beyond the goal and the scope of this project. As a mitigating measure, Andy Cupples suggested that a qualification statement be included in the county options report; The statement should indicate that the estimated capital development costs for each options may reduce by assigning non-jury courtrooms where appropriate prior to implementation of any one of the options.

Option 2: New 11-Courtroom Family/Juvenile Facility.

Construct a new Family/Juvenile facility at or near the new Juvenile Campus; partially relocate Family Law courts and move all of Juvenile Delinquency and Dependency courts out of Hall of Justice and convert use of the vacated courtrooms to Multi-Purpose courtrooms; use the East County Courthouse for non-custody proceedings; continue use of College of Law courtroom. The estimated cost for the new construction is \$32,126,246. The existing buildings will not receive significant capital improvement.

Pros (+) and Cons (-)

Not presented

Option 3: New Juvenile Court + Hall of Justice Expansion

Construct a new 6-courtroom facility at the new Juvenile Campus and expand Hall of Justice for 5 additional courtrooms. The estimated cost of the new building is \$15,067,284; use the East County Courthouse for non-custody proceedings; continue use of College of Law courtroom. Hall of Justice expansion is estimated at \$9,686,457;

the total capital improvement is estimated at \$30,942,176. The existing buildings will not receive significant capital improvement.

Pros (+) and Cons (-)

Not presented

Option 4: New Juvenile Court + New East/Central Satellite Court

Construct a new 6-courtroom facility at the new Juvenile Campus; construct a new satellite court at a location more central to the East County population; use the East County Courthouse for non-custody proceedings; continue use of College of Law courtroom. The estimated cost of the new Juvenile Court building is \$15,067,284; the estimated cost for the East/Central Satellite Court is \$9,385,331; the total capital improvement is estimated at \$24,452,615. The existing buildings will not receive significant capital improvement.

Pros (+) and Cons (-)

Not presented

The Committee directed to proceed with the development of the County Plans.

Closing Discussions:

The issue raised during the Napa meeting over the seeming disparity between the physical rating of the San Bernardino County Historical Courthouse versus the actual condition has been discussed and the Committee approved the evaluation process upon review of seismic evaluation loaded rating results. The said courthouse was rated physically "marginal" before the seismic evaluation and rated "deficient" with the seismic evaluation.

The idea of presenting options that include locating court facilities to serve across jurisdictions or county boundaries was discussed. The Committee recommended that the consultants provide such actions as part of county options where appropriate and present it to counties for their reactions.

Mr. Clarke thanked all present for their participation and concluded the meeting.